

in the overall Desert Storm operation—while still under industry control and support.

Indeed, we rarely hear discussion now about raw material shortages or industrial surge capacity. And we are no longer an Island Nation—this Nation's military industrial base is now part of a global economy. This industrial challenge has parallels in our military command structure.

Secretary Forrestal, intimately familiar with the demands of World War II, enunciated what others often think when he said—"Military strength today is not merely military power but its is economic and industrial strength."

Today we continually find ourselves in peacekeeping and other contingency missions—missions for which our soldiers and leaders are not necessarily trained or equipped. Instabilities are more likely to call for a response to terrorism, civil war, and ethnic strife, instead of territorial invasion.

Future battles may take place in urban environments with political constraints on collateral damage, difficult conflict conditions for any military commander. Deploying military force should not be the solution to every regional, ethnic or humanitarian crises. No forces should deploy overseas unless we establish mission objectives that our political and military leadership can plainly articulate.

A second similarity to the challenges faced by James Forrestal is the confidence of the Nation in the weapon systems and combat platforms within the military inventory. Secretary Forrestal concisely outlined his thoughts in words I believe ring true today—"Men fight not for abstractions, but for the concrete things they can visualize in terms of their own country." Following World War II, this Nation felt confident in its ability and the then-existing "Tools of war".

Following operation Desert Storm, the United States was equally confident in our weapons. I saw first hand during the gulf war the impact that "early" generation precision guided weapons and information technologies, such as JSTARS, had on our decisive victory in that conflict.

The entire world saw those advances also—we now need new technologies to assure that our "cutting edge" is sharp. We must implement those technologies rapidly.

Obviously, we also need new tactics, new systems, and a modernized command, control, and communications management concept. And, there are new threats—ballistic missiles, cruise missiles, chemical and biological weapons, information warfare, and space-based sensors and systems.

These resonate Secretary Forrestal's comments on the need for a "planned integration of all of the elements, energies, and forces in our Nation."

These new threats call into question the traditional weapons of war as well as the accepted practice of splitting budget resources among the military services. Just as aircraft technology spawned a new military service, the new technology forces which will influence future warfare demand that we look at our research and development priorities and the allocation of procurement funds.

The last parallel to 1947 I cite is one I deal with most directly as Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee—that is the pressure of a substantially decreased budget. As each of you know, the defense budget today has reached dangerously low levels. Defense spending has fallen far faster than any other category of Federal spending—dropping 39% since 1985. In constant dollars, it is lower than 1939. Yet, the budget agreement, as well as current public sentiment, makes it most likely that defense spending will be flat through 2002.

The pressures on this flat budget are as great as I have ever seen, and probably greater than the pressures faced by our leaders in 1947. One basic fact is that neither Congress nor DOD have much flexibility in the Defense budget.

Force structure determines the level of military personnel spending—presently about one-third of our budget. Second, these forces must be trained and ready which consumes roughly one-third of the Defense budget devoted to operation and maintenance.

Finally, the remaining one-third is left to modernize and develop the next generation of military systems which will ensure no adversary can match U.S. soldiers, sailors, marines and airmen. However, this remaining "one-third" for modernization is not what it used to be.

In constant 1998 dollars, procurement has declined from \$104 billion in FY 1988 to \$49 billion in FY 1998 and R&D declined from \$48 billion to \$36.5 billion. That decline is exacerbated by on-going contingency operations in Bosnia and Iraq.

The \$10.5 billion committed to Bosnia alone from 1995-1999 will consume all the savings achieved by tough base closure and force structure decisions, while also reducing our investment in modernization and R&D. To meet these challenges, we can no longer afford business as usual at DOD.

This brings our discussion back to my first point—future conflicts will stress our current military and defense industrial establishment. These entities will have to work together to consolidate functions, precisely define missions, eliminate redundancy and assure victory through perfection of planning and execution through total use of command, control, communications and intelligence functions.

The challenge before us today is to look towards a new national defense establishment for a new century in a new millennium—a structure which will allow our great Nation to organize, plan, and maintain peace and security.

Secretary Forrestal once said, "The greatest economy is in preventing war. The best insurance against war is national preparedness and an effective coordination of our foreign and our military policy." These are the goals we continue to strive to achieve. I solicit help from each of you in defining new ideas needed to carry this Nation securely into the 21st century.

Knowing I will be working with all of you in the days ahead, I am honored to be recognized by this group with the Forrestal Award.●

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, MAY 12, 1998

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, May 12. I further ask that on Tuesday, immediately following the prayer, the routine requests through the morning hour be granted and the Senate then begin a period of morning business until 10 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each with the following exceptions: Senator MIKULSKI for 15 minutes, and Senator LOTT or his designee for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAMS. I further ask that at 10 a.m. Senator D'AMATO be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAMS. I further ask that at 12:10 p.m. the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 1046, the National Science Foundation reauthorization bill under a previous consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAMS. I further ask that the Senate recess following the vote on the National Science Foundation reauthorization bill until 12:15 p.m. to allow the weekly party caucuses to meet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, tomorrow morning at 9:30 a.m. the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 10 a.m. Following morning business, Senator D'AMATO will be recognized to offer and debate a bill regarding breast cancer, and it is hoped that a short time agreement can be reached with respect to the D'Amato bill.

At 11 a.m. under a previous order, the Senate will then proceed to the consideration of the conference report to accompany S. 1150, the agricultural research bill. The time until 12:10 p.m. will be divided among several Members for debate on the conference report.

Following that debate, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the National Science Foundation reauthorization bill under a short time agreement. A rollcall vote is expected to occur on passage of that bill at approximately 12:15 p.m. Therefore, all Senators should be aware that the first vote of Tuesday's session will occur at approximately 12:15 p.m.

Also, under a previous order, when the Senate reconvenes at 2:15 p.m. it will resume consideration of the agricultural research conference report. At that time, Senator GRAMM of Texas will be recognized to move to recommit the conference report. There will be 1 hour for debate on the motion equally divided, and at the conclusion or yielding back of time the Senate will proceed to vote on or in relation to the motion. Following that vote, it is hoped that short time agreements can be reached with respect to the agricultural research conference report, any of several high-tech bills or any other legislation or legislative or executive items cleared for action.

And finally, as a reminder to all Members, a cloture vote will occur on Wednesday on the motion to proceed on the missile defense bill.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:36 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, May 12, 1998, at 9:30 a.m.